



DOCKET: 915-007.074

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re Application of: **Seppo POHJA et al**

Serial No.: **10/773,765**

Examiner: **Melvin H. Pollack**

Filed: **February 5, 2004**

Group Art Unit: **2145**

For: **AD-HOC CONNECTION BETWEEN ELECTRONIC DEVICES**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**ELECTION IN RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement of February 8, 2008, please see the election with traverse that follows:

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Marilyn O'Connell  
Marilyn O'Connell

Dated: February 19, 2008

REMARKS

This Election is in response to the requirement made by the Examiner in the Office Action of February 8, 2008.

The Examiner considers the application to comprise two inventions:

Group I: claims 1-27

Group II: claims 28-61

Applicants hereby elect the first group of claims.


The Examiner's reasons are traversed in that this first group should comprise claims 1-31.

In contrast to the assumption by the Examiner, also claim 1 relates to link creation; see last feature of claim 1, which requests the establishment of a communication channel. This corresponds to the last feature of claims 28, 3<sup>rd</sup> feature of claim 30 and last feature of claim 31. (Furthermore, it may be noted that also claim 1 is by no means limited to the usage of RFID tags for detecting a hugging state.)

The difference between Group I and Group II is the causing of a context dependent interaction (last feature of claim 32). This feature is not contained in independent claim 1, and moreover it is not contained in independent claims 28-31 either. Besides independent claim 32, it is only contained in independent claims 58-61.

Thus, Group I should be considered to comprise claims 1-31, since the independent claims of this group comprise corresponding features. The Group II claims should be considered to comprise claims 32-61.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
(203) 261-1234